UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/527,927	10/11/2005	Rainer Heller	2002P13477WOUS	7622

7590 01/25/2008

Siemens Corporation
Intellectual Property Department
170 Wood Avenue South
Iselin, NJ 08830

EXAMINER	
KIM, HEE SOO	
ART UNIT	**PAPER NUMBER**
2157	

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
01/25/2008	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

MN

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/527,927	HELLER ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Hee Soo Kim	2157	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *02 November 2007*.

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *19,20,23~29,31,33~36* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *19,20,23~29,31,33~36* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

This office action is responsive to amendment filed on 11/02/07.

Claim 21, 22, 30 and 32 has been cancelled;

Applicant amended claims 19, 20, 28, 29, 34, and 35.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 19~36 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham* **v.** *John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

Claims 19, 20, 23~29, 31, and 33~36 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Steger et al. hereinafter Steger (U.S 6,505,247) and in view of Hawes (U.S 6,094,686).

Regarding Claim 19,

Steger taught a system for updating a set of multiple items of information displayable on a client display in order to monitor and control a manufacturing production, the system comprising:

a server connected to receive the multiple items of information from a programmable controller or from a diagnostic device in a manufacturing plant and configured to provide the items of information to the client for viewing all of the set of multiple items at one time on the client display (Col. 7, Lines 3~10, Col. 8, Lines 14~19);

first mechanisms for assigning an update stamp to each identifier (Col. 3, Lines 37~41);

a data transmission device for receiving new items of information or transmitting the new items of information between the server and the client to provide updated information units on the client display (Col. 8, Lines 14~19);

second mechanisms for assigning a new update stamp indicating that the new item is a more current information unit than an information unit previously assigned to the same identifier (Col. 7, Lines 10~14, the server stores data elements as delta values or data that has changed from a prior data element);

third mechanisms for sending an updated information unit to the client to replace an information unit having the same identifier and already used in the display based on whether a new update stamp has been assigned (Col. 19, Lines 25~35).

Steger did not explicitly teach first mechanisms for defining an information unit for each of the multiple items in the set, assigning to each unit an identifier, managing the

identifiers to identify the information units, and second mechanisms for assigning the new items of information, each corresponding to an updated item, to the identifiers.

Hawes disclosed it was well-known in the art for information to be identified and managed using identifiers by stating a mechanism for identifying a portion of a page as cacheable or non-cacheable (updateable) is dependent upon on the creator of the page (Col.5, Lines 3~9).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made, to implement, in Hawes' system, a management mechanism for managing the identifiers that are used to identify the information units and for assigning update stamps as this would allow for a more reliable and effective updating system.

Regarding Claim 20,

Steger taught one of the information units in the display is updated based on whether a new update stamp has been assigned to it and wherein one of the information units in the display is not updated in the absence of a new update stamp having been assigned to it (Col. 19, Lines 25~35).

Regarding Claim 23,

Steger taught the server is adapted for providing items of information received from programmable controllers or systems, and/or diagnostic devices or systems (Col. 3, Lines 4~12).

Regarding Claim 24,

Steger taught the server is a Web server (Col. 8, Lines 19~24).

Regarding Claim 25,

Steger taught first mechanism and/or the second mechanism and/or the third mechanism are provided for the purpose of installation on the server.

Regarding Claim 26,

Steger did not explicitly teach the identifiers are Uniform Resource Identifiers as used in the Web environment. Hawes disclosed it was well-known in the art for information to be identified and managed using identifiers by stating a mechanism for identifying a portion of a page as cacheable or non-cacheable is dependent upon on the creator of the page (Col.5, Lines 3~9). See motivation of claim 19.

Regarding Claim 27,

Steger taught the device for the transmission of data takes the form of an Intranet and/or the Internet (Col. 8, Lines 19~24).

Regarding Claim 28,

Steger taught a method for displaying and updating multiple items of information relating to control of a manufacturing production process in an industrial plant system for display on at least one client, the method comprising:

providing the items of information from a programmable controller or diagnostic device in the plant to on make data relevant to control of the manufacturing production process available on a server (Col. 7, Lines 3~10, Col. 8, Lines 14~19);

transmitting multiple new items of information from the programmable controller or diagnostic device in the plant, each new item corresponding to an update to an information unit previously assigned a time stamp, or to the at least one client (Col. 8, Lines 14~19);

assigning each of the new items of information to one of the identifiers and assigning to each said new item a updated time stamp which indicates that said new item is an update relative to a previously received and displayed item of information assigned to the same identifier (Col. 7, Lines 10~14, the server stores data elements as delta values or data that has changed from a prior data element); and

determining by comparing values of an updated stamp with a previously assigned time stamp whether any of the items of information has been modified relative to a previously received item (Col. 19, Lines 25~35).

Steger did not explicitly teach displaying the multiple items of information together in a screen view on a client wherein the individual items of information are separately identifiable and provided in the form of information units corresponding to different items of information are separately updatable and providing identifiers to identify individual ones of the information units.

Hawes disclosed it was well-known in the art for information to be identified and managed using identifiers by stating a mechanism for identifying a portion of a page as cacheable or non-cacheable (updateable) is dependent upon on the creator of the page (Col.5, Lines 3~9).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made, to implement, in Hawes' system, a management mechanism for managing the identifiers that are used to identify the information units and for assigning update stamps as this would allow for a more reliable and effective updating system.

Regarding Claim 29,
Steger taught different ones of the items of information displayed according to the information units are each updated when a comparison indicates that an updated time stamp has been assigned to an associated identifier (Col. 19, Lines 25~35).

Regarding Claim 31,
Steger taught the client is designed as a device for operating and monitoring the production process (Col. 3, Lines 4~12).

Regarding Claim 33,
Steger taught a Web server is used as the server (Col. 8, Lines 19~24).

Regarding Claim 34,
Steger taught the step of determining by comparing values of an updated stamp with a previously assigned time stamp is performed on the server (Col. 19, Lines 25~35).

Regarding Claim 35,
Steger did not explicitly teach the identifiers are Uniform Resource Identifiers as used in the Web environment. Hawes disclosed it was well-known in the art for information to be identified and managed using identifiers by stating a mechanism for identifying a portion of a page as cacheable or non-cacheable is dependent upon on the creator of the page (Col.5, Lines 3~9). See motivation of claim 28.

Regarding Claim 36,
Steger taught the device for the transmission of data is an Intranet and/or the Internet (Col. 8, Lines 19~24).

Conclusion

Examiner's Note: Examiner has cited particular columns and line numbers in the references applied to the claims above for the convenience of the applicant.

Although the specified citations are representative of the teachings of the art and are applied to specific limitations within the individual claim, other passages and figures may apply as well. It is respectfully requested from the applicant in preparing responses, to fully consider the references in entirety as potentially teaching all or part of the claimed invention, as well as the context of the passage as taught by the prior art or disclosed by the Examiner.

In the case of amending the claimed invention, Applicant is respectfully requested to indicate the portion(s) of the specification which dictate(s) the structure relied on for proper interpretation and also to verify and ascertain the metes and bounds of the claimed invention.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Hee Soo Kim whose telephone number is (571) 270-3229. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday 8:00AM - 5:30PM EST.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Ario Etienne can be reached on (571) 272-5001. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

HSK
1/15/08